DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 834 SP 024 219

AUTHOR Bogad, Carolyn McWilliams
TITLE Recruitment and Socialization as Recurring Issues in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Education Courses; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary School Teachers; *Socialization; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS *Student Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study explored the recruitment process, as perceived by preservice teachers who were beginning their teacher training year, and ongoing patterns of recruitment and socialization as they occured during the training year. Fifteen students, interviewed and observed during their student teaching, served as primary subjects throughout their credential program year. The remaining 55 students completing their credentials served as secondary subjects and were also interviewed and observed. Recruitment and socialization were found to exist among a series of subgroups in the subject population. Patterns of recruitment and socialization were found to be highly correlated to a third factor: utilization of university content in student teaching classrooms. Five patterns of original recruitment were delineated: (1) change the system/change society; (2) occupational fit; (3) What am I going to do with my life?--Round 1; (4) What am I going to do with my life?--Round 2; and (5) If you like History/English what else can you do? Extensive case studies are offered for each category. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243834

Recruitment and Socialization as Recurring Issues in Teacher Education

Carolyn McWilliams Bogad

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carolyn McWilliams Bogad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

University of California
Santa Barbara

Adat Ari El Day School
5540 Laurel Canyon Blvd.
North Hollywood, CA 91607

Printed in U.S.A.

April 1984

SP024219

Objectives of the Study

Recruitment and socialization have been described by Waller, Bidwell, and Lortie[1] as key issues in control of educational organizations. Yet, major research work in this area has been focused on recruited, socialized and experienced teachers. The objectives of this study were twofold:

1. to describe the process of recruitment as it was perceived by preservice teachers as they began their teacher training year.
2. to describe ongoing patterns of recruitment and socialization as they occurred during the course of one preservice training year.

Perspectives/Theoretical Framework

In 1932 Willard Waller[2] provided the first organized inquiry into the teacher colleague group. Motivation and discipline were seen as the chief dilemmas of the teacher. Official position and adult status were key factors in reducing the stress of this dilemma. The formation of a tightly knit fighting group, a "society of teachers", a strong "we" against "they" feeling were conventionalized means of group preservation that Waller described as reducers of the stress inherent in teaching. The colleague group enphasized "whatever works" and de-emphasized competition and hierarchies among teaching peers.

Charles Bidwell[3] describes the organizational structure wherein teachers perform their occupational tasks, a pattern labeled "structural looseness":

> The teacher works alone within the classroom, relatively hidden from colleagues and superiors,

> so that he has a broad discretionary jurisdiction within the boundaries of the classroom. Similarly, the school units of a school system are relatively autonomous, so that the teaching and administrative personnel of a school also enjoy broad discretionary powers concerning the procedures to be employed during the period of time that students are assigned to that school.[4]

The system is not totally without controls, however. Professional norms are emphasized through recruitment, training, and ongoing socialization. Standards of student accomplishment are imposed to varying degrees. There is the everpresent possibility of invoking bureaucratic procedures to insure certain uniformities.

Waller's description of the colleague group to which the preservice teacher is being recruited and socialized and Bidwell's descriptions of organizational structure of schools only partly explain the dilemmas which confront the preservice teacher. Each preservice teacher enters a training program with a recruitment history, a set of reasons for choosing teaching as a career. This study found that recruitment history to be closely linked to the ways in which the socialization process played itself out during the preservice year.

Dan Lortie in his major work School-teacher[5] generalizes the recruitment process partially by describing "five attractors" to teaching. The "interpersonal theme" or the opportunity for protracted contact with healthy children was a chief attractor in Lortie's study. The opportunity for service and to continue their tenure in an environment they had very much enjoyed were two other recruitment tools available to teaching. Relative material benefits still served as an attractor to teaching in

the early 1960's when Lortie's data was collected. Time compatability, or the benefits of the academic calendar, was also a key attractor.

What Lortie's study stops short of, and what this study attempts, is to seek linkages between motivations towards teaching and the teacher one becomes. Does the teacher recruited for reasons of service or social change perform in different ways in the classroom than the teacher recruited because of the "continuation" theme? Does the socialization process occur in the same way for each of these individuals?

Howard Becker[6] has provided a model of the socialization process into an occupation. He describes four elements of work identification:

1. occupational title and associated ideology
2. commitment to task
3. commitment to particular organizations or instituitional positions.
4. significance for one's position in the larger society: tending to specify the positions appropriate for a person doing such work or which have become possible for him by virtue of his work.

Becker's work provides linkages between general occupational sociology and more specific work on the sociology of teaching. It also gives us more clearly delineated components of the process of socialization. That is, what are the patterns by which preservice teachers develop an "occupational commitment" to the field of education?

In order to involve oneself in highly personal qualitative research, sensitization to the psychological, contextual literature[7] on "socialization", "recruitment", and "developing an occupational commitment" is extremely beneficial. Adult

development literature provides congruent terminology such as "setting up a life structure", "developing a dream", or "moving into adulthood" that was critical to understanding however "alike" each subject in this study was, a case could equally be built for their uniqueness. Personal factors impinged upon one's teaching continually, and life structure was highly related to one's performance and choices as "teacher".

Method

Out of this literature review guiding propositions were developed which provided the direction for a series of structured interviews and observations which were held immediately prior to and throughout a fifth year secondary credential program at a campus of the University of California.

Fifteen students were interviewed as well as observed in their student teaching classrooms as primary subjects throughout their credential program year. The remaining 55 students completing their credentials during the 1981-82 school year were interviewed and observed at regular intervals and served as secondary subjects. The researcher also attended and served as a non-participant observer at all formal and informal events held as a part of the 1981-82 credential program.

A survey of biographical data was done on each primary and secondary subject. Official records and personal documents served as crosschecks to the validity of interview data. Analytical crosschecks were provided by moving back and forth across literature bases.

Data and Results

Recruitment and socialization were found to be "peculiar"

rather than generalized processes. Common patterns and orientations were found to exist among a series of subgroups in the subject population. Patterns of recruitment and socialization were found to be highly correlated to a third factor: utilization of university content in student teaching classrooms.

This data will be presented by first merely naming the subgroups. A table will follow which shows relational findings on ongoing recruitment, socialization and utilization of university content. These processes will then be further described and illuminated more fully through the presentation of a composite case study or "modal personality" who is described from the point of decision to enter a teacher training program until the completion of that program.

Subgroups from the study were first delineated according to "reason" for original recruitment. To do this, data was analyzed which had been accumulated in interviews held prior to the beginning of the credential program year.

Five patterns of original recruitment were delineated:

CHANGE THE SYSTEM/CHANGE SOCIETY
OCCUPATIONAL FIT
WHAT AM I GOING TO DO WITH MY LIFE?- ROUND I
WHAT AM I GOING TO DO WITH MY LIFE? - ROUND II
IF YOU LIKE HISTORY/ENGLISH WHAT ELSE CAN YOU DO?

A complete analysis of the data revealed the relationships or patterns which follow in Table 1.

ORIGNIAL REASON FOR RECRUITMENT

RELATED FACTORS	Change the System	Occupational Fit	Round I	Round II	History or English
Chief Socializer	Students	Master Teacher and Evaluation	Not Socialized	University Staff and Students	Content
Utilization of University Content	High	Dependent Upon Orientation of Master Teacher	Low	Highest	Erratic
Chief "Recruiter" At End Of Program	Teacher Politics and Needy Students	Own Classrooms and "Smell of Chalk"	Not Present	Professional Skill and Knowledge	Continued Attraction To Content and Eyes On Career Ladder

Table 1.

The following five "case studies" or "modal personalities" will further illiminate the relationships shown in Table 1.

Change the System/Change Society

The students who fell into this group had strong feelings about teaching and a strong experiential base with students from which to operate. These are students who have been in the trenches-- they've organized backpacking trips for inner city children, supervised CETA workers. Their commitment to students typifies them when they enter the program and continues throughout the year. They are the students most likely to be seen at pep rallies and football games; they sponsor the dungeons and dragons club or chess club at lunch; may tutor a child after school.

They are disdainful of teachers somewhat when they enter the program. They see those who "shouldn't be teaching", see themselves as viewing teaching in another way, and say that if burn-out happens to them they'll get out (maybe to go to law school where their parents always hoped their social action concerns would lead them).

They know from the beginning what they want out of the program: they want to learn to teach and to teach good. They are hungry for both theories and practical experiences-- they want to know why they are doing what they are doing. The "mindlessness" they see in the system disturbs them.

Social change is a general issue in these students' lives. More than any other group they are expressive of the ancillary rewards of teaching-- time to spend with a family, time to become "self-actualized". Teaching is one way they see towards "self-actualization"-- they are good with young adults and know it.

Their chief concern as they enter the program is can they make it in the system? Are they too radical? Will they get too discouraged?

As these students moved through the credential program year their own students became their chief socialization agents. They each apprenticed themselves to a "master craftsman" in their first student teaching assignment without the idealization or worship common in many other master teacher/student teacher relationships. They merely dug in up to their elbows in the details and drudgery of classroom life. They mastered detail well enough to become the student teachers most likely to have the semblance of an individualized program in their classrooms by the end of the year. "Needs of individual students" became their primary concern and theose needs were focused on outside of the classroom life as well as inside.

This focus on individual students at times brought a great deal of personal pain. One student

teacher lost one of his students in a car accident midway through the program. It was a fact he shared with no one, and the researcher only found out when she called to see why he had dropped out of the world for a week. This was a student who had severe home problems and to whom the student teacher had gotten quite close. He had the very strong feeling that somehow he could have prevented this accident from happening.

The focus on students, however, was consistently centered on a desire to help them learn more and to be more successful in school.

This group had the second highest useage of university content present in classroom observations. This may have been because of the fit between the university orientation towards both social change and needs of students and these students own orientations. The university gave them a way to change the system--hands on tools-- and they applied them. They were not public about their commitments towards university content (no evidence of "this wonderful concept attainment lesson I planned" in problem seminars from this group!). I think both university personnel and their preservice teacher peers would have been extremely surprised by the style of their classrooms.

Contrary to their own fears, these students also slipped into the teacher colleague group with relative ease. Their disdain for the system moved quickly to the level of "lack of administrative support". More than any other group of students they were critical of the looseness of procedures in the schools. They were furious at the lack of concern over student absences, over the fact that no one told them a child was getting special education resource help outside of their class, over the lack of a consistent homework policy, etc. etc.

By the end of the school year they were firmly enmeshed in teacher politics and spoke of the collegial "we". They were now a "teacher" and firmly committed to defending the role. Their concerns were no longer colleagues who had "burned out" but could they keep up the energy and not "burn out" themselves? Teachers were a newly discovered downtrodden group. Teacher politics and "helping kids who are so needy" were their chief motivators as they looked towards their first year of teaching.

Occupational Fit

"There was a moment when I knew this was it!"
"I like the teachers I've met and they think I'll be good at it."
"I've had experience with kids and I like them."
"It's a good profession for women."
"I worked in a school as an aide and felt more comfortable in the teachers' lounge than anyplace I've been."
"I taught swimming and found I have a knack for it."

If there are born teachers then this group was it. They loved everything and did it all naturally: the bulletin boards, color coded dittoes, fieldtrips, creative lessons, report cards were "exciting", discipline just one more set of techniques to learn. And they were good-- everybody said so. "The best student teacher I have ever had" was a common comment from master teachers.

The focus from the very beginning of the program was on the master teacher as Socializer. Their goals as they began the program was to "get experience" and they sought out "experience" continually: in the classroom they were on their feet more than any other group, they planned more lessons, they graded more papers.

The application of university content in this group was most erratic. If the master teacher had similar training and utilized the techniques taught in the university classrooms then the student teacher applied these techniques also. If the master teacher did not then the student teacher adopted the master teacher's alternate style with her own creative embellishments.

Evaluation was a primary concern of this group of students throughout the program. This impacted upon the application of university content. If tasks were assigned, the student teachers did it. If there was positive feedback from the master teacher she would do it again. If there was negative feedback there was no evidence of that strategy being used again.

Bureaucratic procedures seemed to be a key area of control for these students. Competency exams and getting through the grammar text were chief anxieties for the English student teachers. If "Time" magazine was delivered to the social studies classroom each week, the student teacher felt compelled to cover it even if it meant rewriting virtually every story at an appropriate reading level.

If they weren't using university contentoften, what were these student teachers doing? Careful analysis of classroom anecdotal records showed these student teachers were the ones most likely to discover strategies and models of teaching on their own. For example, all eight steps of a directed teaching model were highly likely to be used even if such a "model" had not been presented to them. They were likely to pick up a copy of Assertive Discipline from the teachers' lounge and begin using that system, or to pick up lesson ideas from another teacher. The focus was on the concrete-- "what can I do tomorrow?" and their reference point was the school setting.

This group saw themselves as teachers. Their youth was the only thing that distinguished them in the school environment. They felt at home, and swings in commitment towards teaching that were present in other subgroups did not occur in this group. Recruitment feelings were high at the end of the year as they were at the beginning. They couldn't wait to "get their own classroom" and "organize their files" over the summer.

To be very unobjective, this group suffered most greatly when inadequate supervision and poor master teacher placement were present. A group who was so motivated by bureaucratic procedure and evaluation was impacted greatly by observation and feedback from a university bridge. The strong mentor relationship that developed between master teacher and student teacher allowed a "master" teacher to have maximum effect. In those cases where a strong placement with a highly trained, university committed master teacher occurred, those student teachers truly performed as the best education has to offer. In cases where this did not occur, in the researchers' opinion, the gap between potential and performance was tragic.

What Am I Going to Do with my Life?- Round I

When one does descriptive research in classrooms, one is continually amazed at what a low level things fall apart at when they fall apart. Waller speaks of the classroom dilemma being negotiated first through "official position plus adult status".

The students in this group clearly had said before the program began that "maybe it'll give me a chance to grow up" or "maybe it'll give me some direction in my life". In the first three observations in this group I saw one student in a junior high classroom attempt to give a lecture while dressed in shorts and beach thongs, one student sitting in an assigned seat with the students who raised her hand to ask is she "could teach now?", and one student who showed up fifteen minutes late to his class because he "couldn't find a projector in the school". All used to the role of students, they each at the same time received A's on their university midterms.

These students had virtually no work experience prior to entering the program. They had never shown they could even be a good cook at Burger King. Their experience with children was minimal. They remembered their own junior high and high school years as times of great pain, and described themselves as "social outcasts".

This "unfinished business" from their own secondary school experiences distinguished this group and had an extremely painful impact upon their re-entry to high school or junior high in the teaching role. They saw the same social games and winners and losers as they remembered from high school. Having to reconfront the high school football star from the other side of the desk was scarey business.

Because of very intricate screening procedures, only three students were in this category. Two dropped out during the course of the year, and the third hid behind a sympathetic master teacher and perhaps only taught 10-12 lessons the entire year. This third student reported at the end of the year "at least I hung in there and got the credential-- next year I'll travel and do some waitressing".

What Am I Going to Do with my Life?- Round II

The students in this group have come back to "The Road Not Taken". In their mid-twenties to mid-thirties they came back to become a teacher as a career move. Successful in previous careers, they began to feel a couple of years ago that " If the diety asked I wouldn't be able to justify my existence". Sales was the most common previous career.

These student teachers entered the program full of excitement and commitment. They saw the move into teaching as personal/ethical work. They desired to "help someone". They were also attracted to the idea of a collegial environment in contrast to the hierarchical, competitive environment they had been a part of. They were oriented towards education in their personal lives, and saw teaching as a commitment to "lifelong learning".

This group is not blindly idealistic, however. They have seen friends who are teachers "burn out". They know schools are "nuts". One said, "I notice, though, that I hated my job enough to quit and they haven't".

Perhaps because of their own personal changes this group more than any other seemed to flourish in the adolescent environment of junior high. They loved the energy and they loved every single silly joke. In social settings they often took on the role of the thirteen year old!

What they wanted/expected out of the credential program as they began the year was low key: "ways not to bore kids", "a chance to learn what educators know", "academic stimulation".

The life supports were there to make other students somewhat jealous of this group: They had made financial arrangements to cover them for the year, they lived in a real "home", they had the clothes to dress like a professional and were comfortable in them, if they were involved in a relationship it had settled into an "easy" stage and if they were single they were not frantic about finding a partner. Many had their own children and were not frightened by being an authority figure and friend to children.

This group of students know how to be "employees"-- the continual pace of teaching and the energy required to be on everyday was not a concern for this group as it was for others who were transitioning from the student role.

Being good "employees" was a comment often made by master teachers. Attention to detail was continually evident in these classrooms-- roll was taken smoothly, homework systems organized quickly, bulletin boards fastidious, objectives on the chalk board, Spanish names pronounced correctly, etc. etc. It was as if this group more easily than any other looked around and quickly defined the "work" of teaching-- the hidden agenda not spoken of in university classrooms.

Their concerns emerged early also: "bitching of other student teachers", "my colleagues - I want to fire them all!", "the babies I have to be peers with". Collegiality was sought in other directions. Close relationships developed very quickly with both master teachers and university staff. This strong parallel commitment most clearly defines the development of this group.

For the two content areas (English and social studies) involved in this study satisfaction of needs differed greatly. The social studies students saw themselves at the university as "sponges"-- they wanted to be continually "pushed harder" and "given more". A few went to the national social studies conference, bought huge "cognitive moral development kits" and tried to figure out how they could sell materials they had developed. They saw their university professors as "mentors". Their master teachers were well trained in university content and saw their student teachers as "better than me" and "someone I am learning from". The highest application of university content came from this social studies subgroup.

The English students did not fare in the same manner. They saw most everything the university had to offer as "totally worthless" except for a month long workshop on the writing process held in January. The emphasis in the public schools was seen as in total opposition to the few things they "did learn". Grammar texts were at best dealt with as "this monster I am trying to ignore" and pushing the students to pass competency exams seemed incongruent to what they had "learned" in university classrooms. This group was unable on their own to come up with the kinds of creative strategies the "occupational fit" group discovered on their own or to come to the resolution of saying "Competency exams are about learning to read and write-- isn't that what I want for my students?" like one "occupational fit" preservice teacher said. They did not have the same structure and framework that were given to the social studies students, nor the same kind of trained master teachers and their development and attitudes differed.

That structure provided in the social studies program was a very simple orientation towards "what to teach and how to teach it" with some blanks filled in during the credential program and some you will have to fill in on your own". This "Round II" subgroup more than any other of the social studies subjects took that mandate and flew with it. Their concerns even centered around that mandate as the program evolved-- the continual search for resources, the "laziness" of their peers in wanting to "borrow" all their lessons and not contribuiting ideas.

These students differed also in their early move into student centered concerns (January)-- a

point most subjects except the social changers came to much later (April-June). Their focus on students was more classroom centered, however. Conflict and concern arose over situations they defined as "kids vs. administration". They were ready to be, and saw themselves as advocates for student learning and student needs. Their confidence and maturity gave them the luxury of "bucking the system" more than once and succeeding.

As the year came to a close the majority of talk about master's degree programs in education came from this group. There was also an almost paralyzing attack of "will I get a teaching job?" that hit in May and June. The concern that one would end up some "place without any resources" became paramount.

The strongest recruitment device that served to motivate these students at the end of the year was an evergrowing collection of professional knowledge they were anxious to use. That this professional knowledge could be used in an environment with adolescents was most appealing. Alternatives such as training and development work in business or university careers were discussed in interviews only by members of this subgroup.

If You Like History/English What Else Can You Do?

This group of students sailed through their undergraduate studies totally enthralled with their majors until a giant case of senioritis struck and they were confronted with the cosmic dilemma of "what do you do with your life if you like history/English?". More than one student said:

> "If you are a history major you can be a lawyer or a teacher. I didn't want to be a lawyer."

Some may have done a little preprofessional work with students during their senior year just to try out teaching. They didn't "love it" but they didn't find it offensive either. Their parents saw teaching as a moral, respectable choice, and especially for women they saw teaching in positive economic terms compared to other jobs open to them.

They went into the credential program with a "what do I have to lose?" attitude. If nothing else the student teaching would give them confidence in speaking in front of people, and the credential would be something to add to the resume. As early as October their perspectives begin to change. I began to hear comments like "I may learn a few things here" and "I'm really enjoying the kids".

The gaining of self confidence issue quickly translated itself as "stage fright". As soon as that issue was addressed, they were hit with the greatest discipline concerns of any subgroup.

This group played out their lives to two very different groups during the course of the program. They were the most likely to have "significant others" in undergraduate programs or graduate degree programs in other departments. The public image and low social status of teachers was a continual concern for this group that did not dissipate during the course of the program.

The focus in the classroom was on content. The painful realization of one "contemporary women's social history"major that teaching social studies meant world geography and climate zones was not untypical. This dilemma led this group to identify the primary "work" of teaching as library research on the content area.

Details and classroom "jobs"were often unnoticed or given low priority. These are the classrooms where I saw the unreadable dittoes, vacant bulletin boards, roll not taken, assemblies missed and lively, active discussions with highly involved students.

The socialization of this subgroup developed chiefly as an evolution of university class material being seen as new "content" to learn. Learning about the writing process or studying development of adolescents hooked some of these students on "teaching". Strategies of teaching as compared to strategies of war turned one student on. Modern social history of schools hooked another. The "totality" of schooling and schools was mentioned by these students more than any other group. This is the subgroup who would have loved to read Waller, Bidwell and Lortie! Their focus tended to be holistic rather than concrete.

Their utilization of university strategies was erratic. Several students even at the end of the year saw "lesson plans" as content notes. Evaluation of materials and strategies tended to be teacher centered rather than student centered. If a strategy or technique turned them on they used it.

This group had the least contact with colleagues outside of their content area. Social studies student teachers saw themselves as having nothing in common with English student teachers and visa versa. They were the subgroup most likely to participate in the more formal university classes rather than more informal classes such as problem seminars.

As this group resolved their dilemmas of discipline and motivation toward the end of the year their commitment to education was high. The chief attractors, or recruiting devices for them were two. First, they continued to be turned on by content--"I even talk about world geography at parties" one student said. They also were attracted to the idea of a "professional career" in education-- these students were the most likely of any group to mention aspirations up the career ladder. Most did not see themselves in the classroom longer than five years and had their eyes on more "prestigious" roles in schools.

Conclusions

The data from this study showed a set of relationships between the reasons by which a student is recruited into teaching and the teacher he/she becomes at the end of the preservice year. This initial orientation towards recruitment impacts upon whom the student teacher focuses on as a socialization agent and the degree to which he/she will utilize university content in his/her classroom.

Waller's dilemmas of discipline and motivation were among the initial concerns of all preservice teachers. Several avenues were open to solve this and other dilemmas. Whether a student teacher looked toward university imput or to the high school teachers' lounge could be somewhat predicted by their initial orientation. Adult status also impinged upon the easy solution of discipline problems-- an entry characteristic. When all else failed or a knowledge vacume occurred the preservice teachers formed a "tightly knit fighting group" and shared information on "what works".

Several impacting variables are illuminated in the case studies themselves. Bidwell's "structural looseness" impinged upon smooth patterns of socialization. The "looseness" varied from school site to school site. The English student teachers felt most impinged upon by a highly structured public school setting. Course outlines, grammar texts, and competency exam requirements seemed to create a brick wall as opposed to a bridge between university content and classroom application. This was true for all English subgroups.

Bureaucratic procedures of the university had an impact upon "natural" patterns from the other direction. Classroom assignments and tasks, supervision, the very structure of evaluation tools, the delineation of master teacher responsibilities, and master teacher training "tightened" up application of university content in all subgroups.

When Becker's ruberic of socialization into an occupation[10] is applied to the subjects in this study another area of "structural looseness" in teaching is illuminated. How the "work" of teaching was defined varied greatly from subgroup to subgroup. And one could imagine the strongest student teachers from each group (except Round I) being labeled "good teachers" whether it was because of their commitment to students, their attention to detail, their professional expertise, or their content knowledge.

Educational or Scientific Importance of the Study

Lortie and Bidwell have both stated that recruitment and socialization are key issues in control in educational organizations. The importance of this study lies in the knowledge gained in three areas:

1. the processes involved in initially becoming recruited as a teacher.
2. recruitment and socialization are described as somewhat peculiar processes in order to identify the points at which possible future interventions can be made.
3. highly descriptive case studies or modal personalities illuminate existing data of a more generalized nature.

Limitations

The purpose of this study was descriptive in nature.

Concepts and relationships identified need to be tested under more carefully controlled conditions with a much larger subject population.

NOTES

[1]See Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching, John Wiley, 1932. Bidwell, Charl "The School as a Formal Organization, 1965 and Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher, University of Chicago Press, 1975.

[2]See Waller, Willard, The Sociology of Teaching, 1932.

[3]See Bidwell, Carles "The School as a Formal Organization",1965.

[4]See Bidwell, page 976.

[5]See Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher, 1975.

[6]See Becker, Howard S. Sociological Work: Method and Substance, Transaction Books, 1970.

[7]See Levinson, Daniel J. et al Seasons of a Man's Life, Ballantine Books, N.Y. 1978.Scarf, Maggie. Unfinished Business: Pressure Points in the Lives of Women.Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday and Co. 1980. Sheehy, Gail. Passages.New York, Bantam Books, 1976.

[8]See Waller, 1932

[9]See Bidwell, 1965

[10]See Becker, 1970

[11]See Lortie, 1975